

Comment on the proposed conservation of 31 species-group names originally published as junior primary homonyms in combination with *Buprestis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 3149; see BZN 58: 24–31)

Svatopluk Bílý

Department of Entomology, National Museum, Kunratice 1, CZ 148 00 Praha 4, Czech Republic

I should like to support the application of Charles Bellamy to conserve the 31 names originally published as junior primary homonyms in *Buprestis*. The proposal is in accord with the Code; all the names mentioned were widely and commonly used throughout the 20th-century and to change them would cause a lot of difficulties and confusion.

Comment on the proposed designation of a neotype for *Parasuchus hislopi* Lydekker, 1885 (Reptilia, Archosauria)

(Case 3165; see BZN 58: 34–36)

Axel Hungerbühler

Museum of Paleontology, University of California, 1101 Valley Life Sciences Building, Berkeley, CA 94720, U.S.A.

I am writing in support of Sankar Chatterjee's application to replace the fragmentary lectotype of *Parasuchus hislopi* Lydekker, 1885 by designating a nearly complete skeleton as the neotype. I fully agree with his reasoning.

Many phytosaur taxa (including the type species of *Phytosaurus* Jaeger, 1828) were established on isolated teeth and very fragmentary material. Since Chatterjee (1978) the specific name *hislopi* has been consistently employed for the basal phytosaur taxon represented by the skeletons and other material from the Maleri Formation, though not for other poorly preserved Indian phytosaur material such as *Brachysuchus maleriensis* Huene, 1940 and undescribed specimens from younger beds. Defining *Parasuchus hislopi* by means of an articulated skeleton rather than the fragmentary material of Lydekker (1885) clarifies the application of the generic and specific names, and removes any temptation to establish a new name based on the skeletons.

A number of authors have used *Paleorhinus* Williston, 1904 for any genus of basal phytosaurs, either including *Parasuchus* (which is incorrect for priority reasons) or rejecting *Parasuchus* as a nomen dubium. *Paleorhinus* has indeed become a well-known and widely applied name in the technical literature over the last 40 years, and one objection to the application might be that clarification of *Parasuchus* could lead to the rejection of *Paleorhinus*. However, the application of the name *Paleorhinus* itself is not without ambiguity. I recently re-studied the type specimen of the type species *Paleorhinus bransoni* (results as yet unpublished). The specimen is so poorly preserved that a distinction of *Paleorhinus bransoni* from other basal phytosaur species is problematic. Furthermore, I found it difficult to recognize with confidence features that justify a synonymy of *Paleorhinus* with any other nominal genus of basal

phytosaur such as *Promystriosuchus* Case, 1922, *Francosuchus* Kuhn, 1932, *Ebrachosuchus* Kuhn, 1936 or *Parasuchus* as employed by Chatterjee (1978). Most of the characters suggested so far in favour of a synonymy (e.g. Westphal, 1976; Chatterjee, 1978; Ballew, 1989; Hunt & Lucas, 1991) only describe the more primitive organization relative to more advanced phytosaurs that all these taxa have in common, but do not indicate that these forms are more closely related to each other than to any other non-basal phytosaur.

Nomenclatural stability is hardly achieved by replacing a nomen dubium (*Parasuchus*, as defined by the original material) with a name of uncertain or at best debatable application (*Paleorhinus*). The application of names among basal phytosaurs must be fixed and the taxa in question need to be re-studied, before decisions on the synonymy of specific and generic names can be presented. In contrast to most other type specimens involved (with the exception of those of *Ebrachosuchus*), the proposed neotype for *Parasuchus hislopi* is well-preserved, and it is one of the very few complete phytosaur skeletons known. I recommend that the Commission use its plenary power to approve Sankar Chatterjee's proposal.

Additional reference

Westphal, F. 1976. Phytosauria. Pp. 99–120 in Kuhn, O. (Ed.), *Handbuch der Paläoherpetologie*, vol. 13, Thecodontia. Fischer, Stuttgart.

Comments on the proposed precedence of the specific name of *Euphryne obesus* Baird, 1858 over that of *Sauromalus ater* Duméril, 1856 (Reptilia, Sauria) (Case 3143; see BZN 58: 37–40)

(1) Harry L. Taylor

Biology, Regis University, 3333 Regis Boulevard, Denver, Colorado 80221–1099, U.S.A.

I support the proposal to give the name *Sauromalus obesus* (Baird, 1858) precedence over *S. ater* Duméril, 1856.

Prof Montanucci and his colleagues are to be commended for (1) an exceptionally thorough and objective evaluation of the evidence, and (2) making the herpetological community aware of the problem through two detailed publications in *Herpetological Review* (Montanucci, 2000 and 2001).

It is clear that nomenclatural stability should obtain in this case.

(2) Kenney L. Krysko

Division of Herpetology, Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A.

I have read Case 3143. I agree with the authors and believe that they make a strong argument for using the name *Sauromalus obesus* in preference to *S. ater*.